DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 115 627 SP 009 697

TITLE	Text of Presentation Monday, June 7, 1971; CAHPER Convention, University Committee Athletic Scholarship Panel.
INSTITUTION	Windsor Univ. (Ontario). Faculty of Physical and Health Education.
PUB DATE	71
NOTE	28p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	*Athletes; *Athletic Programs; *Awards; Foreign Countries; Recruitment; *Scholarships
IDENTIFIERS	*Canada

ABSTRACT

The introduction of new scholarships and awards in Canadian college athletics led to a panel discussion at the 1971 Canadian Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation on the issue of opposing or supporting such scholarships. The first participant supported them and felt it was wrong to assume Canadian sports would automatically imitate American mistakes of ignoring the athlete's academic life and allowing too much recruitment activity. The second participant felt athletes do not need special scholarships because in Canada financial aid is available to anyone who really wants a college education. Also, competitive recruiting would mean appealing to Americans to the disadvantage of Canadian boys, and the healthy, relaxed atmosphere surrounding Canadian sports in the past would be lost. A government spokesman supported third-party scholarships, particularly those in which the athlete gets the money from the government and decides for himself where to go to school. He did not see why sports should be singled out as a cultural activity not worth supporting. He also suggested that offering scholarships would keep promising athletic talent in Canada. The next participant warned that over-recruiting and commercialization in sports would follow, with physical education teachers having to engage in extensive recruiting and noncompetitive sports losing support. He said that the costs incurred in attracting larger audiences to big sports events cancel the profits. Reactors then gave additional views to which panelists replied. (CD)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED115627

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

2

TEXT OF PRESENTATIONS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Monday, June 7, 1971

CAHPER CONVENTION

Waterloo, Ontario

DEALING WITH

A T H L E T I C S C H O L A R S H I P S

PANEL: Mr. Maurice Regimbal
Director of Athletics
Laurentian University
Sudbury, Ontario

Dr. Maury Van Vliet
Dean, Faculty of Physical Education
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta

Mr. Lou Lafaive
Director, Fitness & Amateur Sports
Ottawa, Ontario

Dr. Donald MacIntosh
Director, School of Physical Education
Queen's University
Kingston, Ontario

REACTORS: Dr. Patricia Lawson
Chairman of Instruction Division
University of Saskatchewan
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

Dr. Earle Zeigler
University of Illinois
Champaign, Illinois

CHAIRMAN: Professor Dick Moriarty
Athletic Director
University of Windsor
Windsor, Ontario

FORMAT FOR C.A.H.P.E.R. PANEL ON

FITNESS AND AMATEUR SPORT DIRECTORATE

ATHLETIC SCHOLARSHIPS

Monday, June 7, 3:45 - 5:00 p.m.
University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario

3:45 - 3:50 p.m.	Introduction of Panel Outlining of Program Format and Statement of the Problem - Professor Dick Moriarty
3:50 - 3:55 p.m.	Mr. Maurice Regimbal - The Case for Athletic Scholarships
3:55 - 4:00 p.m.	Dr. M. VanVliet - The Case Against Athletic Scholarships
4:00 - 4:05 p.m.	Mr. L. Lefaive - The Government Perspective on Fitness and Amateur Sport Directorate and Hockey Canada Scholarships
4:05 - 4:10 p.m.	Dr. D. MacIntosh - Practical Implications of Involvement in Athletic Scholarships Emphasizing the Role of University Athletes and Athletics
4:10 - 4:20 p.m.	An audience listening team - Dr. Pat Lawson and Dr. Earle Zeigler - will make reaction presentations on each of the four position presentations.
4:20 - 4:30 p.m.	The four members of the panel will be given two and one half minutes each to interact on each other's presentations and also the comments of the reactor.
4:30 - 5:00 p.m.	Open forum with questions from the audience directed to the panel.

Dr. P.J. Galasso, Chairman of the University Division C.A.H.P.E.R., introduced Chairman Dick Moriarty.

Chairman Dick Moriarty - the panelists need little in the way of introduction.

1. Mr. Maurice Regimbal, a fellow athletic director of long standing at Laurentian University, associate Dean for administration of physical education, former president of the C.I.A.U. and a Director of Hockey Canada.

2. Dr. Maury Van Vliet, Dean of Physical Education at the University of Alberta, immediate past president of the C.I.A.U., one of Canada's most respected professionals in academics and athletics.

3. Mr. Lou Lafaive, a fellow Windsorite, Director of Fitness and Amateur Sports Directorate, a man with long and enviable record of public service including Direction of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and also work in the Immigration Department, former coach and athlete of University of Ottawa and a Director of Hockey Canada.

4. Dr. Donald MacIntosh, Director of the School of Physical Education at Queen's University, Chairman of the Ontario Council of University Schools of Physical Education, former coach and athlete in Western Canada.

5. Dr. Patricia Lawson, associate professor and Chairman of Instruction Division of the School of Physical Education at Saskatchewan, President of the C.I.A.U.W. and Vice President elect of C.A.H.P.E.R. One of Canada's most outstanding women athletes and professional educators.

6. Dr. Earle Zeigler is extended a warm welcome back to Canada since he will be returning to Western Ontario in the fall. He is former Director of Physical Education at Western, held a similar position at University of Michigan, has been Director of the Graduate Program at University of Illinois. His extensive research and writing include over 200 articles, 10 books, and a long list of advisement of Doctoral Dissertations. Among his professional recognition is included membership in the exclusive Fellowship of the American Academy of Physical Education.

This is your panel.

About one month ago I sent the members of the panel this statement of the problem and Definition of Terms.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Throughout the history of Canadian university athletics individual institutions, athletic associations and the Canadian Intercollegiate Athletic Union have traditionally opposed the concept of athletic scholarships. Practices have varied over the years, but until recently the basic philosophical position has not wavered. The introduction of Fitness and Amateur Sport Directorate scholarships and Hockey Canada awards has brought to the fore the fundamental question of whether the university student athlete should be paid for athletic prowess. Some university educators feel that this question should be answered in the affirmative, thereby providing the athlete with the opportunity to develop athletic excellence and launching Canada into an era of increased social significance for university athletics on both the national and international scene. Others answer in the negative, maintaining that the acceptance of pay for play will deny the athlete an opportunity to develop joint academic-athletic excellence and will put Canada on a path of athleticism with uncontrollable recruiting, subsidizing and the anti-educational practices identified with university athletics in the United States. There does seem to be agreement among all that this is indeed a critical point in Canadian university athletics, and that we may be at the point of no return on this fundamental issue.

We have a panel of four experts who will debate this issue. They represent a broad spectrum of Canadian life and education and many years of theory and practice in university athletics, including extensive philosophical contemplation, empirical observation, theoretical thought, and research on the question of athletic scholarships.

In addition, we have an audience listening team who will react to the presentations.

Twenty minutes have been reserved at the end of the program for an open forum which will allow members of the audience to direct questions to those on the panel or reaction team.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Athletic scholarship equals the awarding of money or kind to a university athlete on the basis of

(1) athletic ability
(2) athletic and academic ability
(3) need and athletic ability
(4) academic and athletic ability plus need and regardless of terminology used to describe it.

In other words, athletic scholarship equals awarding of money or kind for athletic prowess regardless of whether or not the selection includes academic ability and/or financial need and regardless of whether they are called scholarships, bursaries, grants-in-aid, financial awards, etc.

Third-party scholarship equals an athletic scholarship involving the athlete (first party), the university (second party) and another individual or group (third party), such as the Fitness and Amateur Sport Directorate, industry, etc.

Chairman Dick Moriarty: Mr. Maurice Regimbal - The Case for Athletic Scholarships

Mr. Maurice Regimbal:

I guess no single subject has been debated more often by more people in sports in the setting of locker rooms, showers, hotel rooms, and bars. Personally, I feel the subject is worn out, because I don't feel that any amount of discussion
I would like to establish first some of the facts as I see them. Can we agree on the fact that universities in Canada control reasonably well their own admission policies? There may be variations here and there but I cannot see any reason to feel that because of aid to athletes there is any danger of affecting the present standard of admissions. Any change in such policy will be made, more than likely, because of academic considerations. I would like to suggest that universities do consider other standards than academic ability to determine admission policy, but I'm sure that this will only be done if ever, after having been debated thoroughly, through the mazes of committees which now exist on most campuses. The question is now reduced to its most simple form; should such students who have athletic ability receive any kind of aid, financial or in kind.

When I listen to the arguments of those who oppose the idea, I'm always struck by the fact that the arguments have a negative ring.

The advance notice on this discussion contains the general tone of the argument when it says on the paper entitled, "Statement of Problem", others answer in the negative maintaining that the acceptance of pay for play will deny the athlete an opportunity to obtain joint athletic and academic excellence and would put Canada in a path of athleticism with uncontrollable recruiting, subsidizing, and anti-education practice identified with university athletics in the United States. This is certainly a capsule statement which is difficult to penetrate; and, therefore, difficult to argue against, for when we argue against it, it presupposes that you admit much of what it says. I can only say at the moment that I don't like to leave from a very bad experience to set Canadian standards of practice. I'm really sick and tired of discussing this subject in the shadow of the American monster. Frankly, I would just like us to do things for our own reasons, for the benefit of our program and our athletes, and our country. If the exponents of the views against aid to athletes can support their standards with that other than the abuses they can detect on American campuses I'll be more than willing to listen.

Frankly the reason for my being open to the question of aid to athletes originally was very simple. Universities were, in effect, in the practice of doing it. I didn't do any research on the subject and

I don't have a file on the matter but as long as I can remember universities had in one form or another given special aid to athletes. I just couldn't bring myself to support a stand which is contrary to the existing facts because I don't see anything wrong with it. Through the years some universities have officially adopted policies giving aid to athletes and I feel that being against such a factor becomes a bit academic.

More recently, however, we have seen our country develop a positive policy towards sports. I happen to agree with the statement made in The Task Force Report on Sports by the Secretary-General of UNESCO. It reads and I quote, "it need hardly be added that the role of sport in mass culture is still at a very early stage. The inescapable fact is that sport has not entered the mainstream of social evolution." Monsieur Rene Maheu, Director-General of UNESCO, summed up its new place as follows:

> "A world-wide social phenomenon, whose roots ramify deeply into the young and adult lives of men and women, exercise and spectacle, asceticism and recreation, ocupation and education, hygiene and culture, sport is no longer a whim of individual escapism. Henceforth, it is closely linked, sometimes cause, sometimes effect, or mere symptom, always noteworthy, with the great problems on whose solution the future of our civilization depends. Urbanization, community organization in rapidly developing societies, the building up of structures and states, that have suddenly become independent, the use of leisure provided by the mechanization of work or by under employment."

The report with which we may or may not agree presents to me a basic policy statement which is sound and proposes practical measures to put this policy into effect. If you read the report, and check out the facts, you will soon realize that Canada has, in effect, gone quite far in following through on many of its recommendations. One of the recommendations is aid to athletes. I can live quite comfortably with it. When I look at the exigencies of sport and the level at which the CIAU has decided to participate, I realize the amount of time, effort and dedication of athletes will have to apply to their own skills to perform at the required level. We have now gone beyond the national level of competition and have commonly agreed to participate at the international level in FISU where the standard of performance is of world class. The facts are that we have jointly agreed to carry out programs to give the opportunity to athletes to develop to the best of their ability. If we believe that in doing so we are impeding their education, then I think we should reconsider our stand. I would like to advance, however, that the best education an athlete can receive is the opportunity to practice skills with the best. How this will affect his academic work--I'm not sure, but I don't see any contradiction in pursuing academic excellence and excellence in athletics. A boy might need some help in reaching those two objectives; but when such ability exists in one person, I feel as an educator, I am obliged to do everything I can to see that he has every chance of reaching his

objectives. Of course, I realize that such policy may create some problems. Has anything worthwhile ever been done without encountering them. Surely if we pool our brains, we can come up with broad principles which serve as guidelines for those people who have to run the program.

Of course, if we want to compete, we'll have to recruit, and we do recruit. As I look at the people involved in our program, I somehow feel that I can trust most of them. As I look across the country, it is easy to observe that all universities don't start on the same base. There are large universities and small universities, some with 25,000 students and some with 1,500 and 2,000. In order to compete together on the same field I think we must accept that universities will have to assess their own situation, in their own area, and make the individual decisions necessary to obtain the objectives they set. If among their decisions, the university reaches the conclusion that to complete successfully, its athletes will have to receive some sort of help, I think this would be entirely logical and I trust that it can set up a policy of its own with the respect and dignity of the school, the dignity of the athlete, the coach and anyone else associated with the institution. I end up here where I was at June of last year at the meeting in Banff. Faced with a pertinent development let's agree to give all universities the privilege of setting up programs of aid if they feel it necessary to reach the objective that they set.

Chairman Dick Moriarty: Dr. Maury Van Vliet - The Case Against Athletic Scholarships

Dr. Maury Van Vliet:

Mr. Chairman, fellow panelists, critique expert and gentlemen.

I'm probably going to do all those things Maurice doesn't like to have done in reviewing the case for and against but I think I have that privilege and I plan to pursue it in my own way. I'm also going to be exceedingly brief and directly to the point. This is not a prepared literary gem but simply an assembly of some of my views and attitudes as I have studied the situation on the Canadian scene for the last 35 years.

In the first place, it's my view that problems do exist in terms of aid to athletes, 90% of the problems which we normally consider objectionable are directly attributed to recruiting. If there was no money involved between athlete and coach or athlete and athletic director, then the recruiting policies are usually wholesome and based on six positive things as academic program, staff capabilities, campus atmosphere, facilities, equipment, and athletic program. What our boys in Canada really want is excellence of coaching, equipment, facilities, and program, with particular emphasis on program. Many of them would like the chance to swim against Yale, wrestle against Oklahoma State, and play volleyball against UCLA. The thought of our bidding against these schools for athletic talent is not only rather unsavory but in my mind, completely ridiculous.

Athletic scholarships, so called, are not required in Canadian universities for in most cases financial help is available either

through government or university sources for everyone truly wishing a university education.

Once you begin paying one athlete, you are soon required to pay them all. And in many cases this would completely bankrupt Canadian universities who are attempting to develop a good program in athletics. Nearly every study that has been undertaken in this regard, in terms of financial aid to athletes (of course it's based on the United States because to all intents and purposes it's the only place in the world where it exists) most studies would indicate that the average sized, if you like, larger institution is usually involved in $250,000 a year and very few, even at the smallest level, escape the $75,000 tag. In any event, I don't think we can really compete with U.S. universities as far as the really outstanding athletes are concerned. There are always exceptions to this, but this of course depends on personality of the individual, what his family thinks, what his relationship is with the closest university where his uncle attended, and a lot of other things. It is a well-known fact, however, that in general over the years, when Notre-Dame, Texas, Harvard, Yale, Indianna or U of C comes to call, no Canadian University can be considered a competitor. The most damaging feature when you consider financial aid to athletes, as acceptable on the Canadian scene, it's either recruiting of non-Canadians for football and basketball players to the detriment of developing Canadian athletes.

Over the years, most Canadian universities have worked very hard to employ legitimately acceptable academic staff members who are off the campus half the time on the recruiting trail and the other half running a food and housing service along with a psychiatric clinic. We have mostly been free of the non-academic slave-driver, and the concentration camp director. It has been a great place to live, coach, and be professionally acceptable. Thank God we have no evidence to date that the will of the Canadian people has anything to do with ill-informed, non-research points of view of our sports writers who make their living from professional sports.

Finally, I will say that if the people of Canada really wish to provide financial aid for athletes, I suggest a fund of three of four million dollars to be set aside each year by the federal government and the prospective university athlete can then apply for the equipment, tuition, and room and board to attend a university of his choice thus limiting all insidious practices involved in recruiting. In other words, if we are going to have some financial aid, I think the way the government's attempting to do it is the right way.

Chairman Dick Moriarty: Mr. Lou Lefaive - The Government Perspective on Fitness and Amateur Sports Directorate and Hockey Canada Scholarships, What does the Government Expect of Canadian Universities and Canadian Student Athletes.

Mr. Lou Lefaive:

Mr. Chairman, fellow panelists, reactors, ladies and gentlemen.

Obviously I am neither for or against scholarships in this particular

session. The government has made its position known; the government does offer scholarships. They began a program last year where we offered approximately $100,000 worth of scholarships to athletes to enable them to pursue academic excellence and athletic excellence. Our program is not designed to increase intercollegiate programs; it is not designed to foist scholarships upon universities. Our relationship is with the athlete applying for our scholarship. A committee is brought together to review the application, decide which students will be offered scholarships. He then chooses his university; goes to the school of his choice if it is in Canada; although we allow exceptions to that, we allow exceptions if the kind of program that he wants to pursue either academically or athletically, or the kind of coaching that he requires, the kind of facilities or climate in which he has to reside to carry on his program is outside the country then we are prepared to accept him.

Our reasons for being in scholarships is that we feel that athletics is a part of our culture. We subsidize other areas of culture, why not this one? We feel that athletes should not have to make the choice between pursuing excellence versus an academic trivia. That if there is a problem of need haven't attempted to define need, and I don't think I want to try one it here, but if there is a question of need, then we feel that the government should provide the opportunity for that athlete to pursue both. If we believe that sport is part of our culture, then why not subsidize it as we do other areas. It is important to realize that the Fitness and Amateur Sport Scholarships are not tied to university participation. It is not necessary for the athlete to participate in the university program. It is necessary only that he participate in the sport.

It is my feeling that a lot of the concern surrounding the whole question of scholarships is altogether preoccupied with football and hockey. As you know last year our scholarships did not include football players. It did not include it for a very deliberate reason, for our policies are aimed at the strengthening of our international contingencies, and we gave scholarships only in those sports that have an international outlet. Football did not have an outlet and was excluded; lacrosse was excluded.

What do we expect? We expect that our scholarship program will increase the level of participation and will keep Canadian athletes at home; will help to stem the pressures on them from recruiting abroad, particularly in the United States, and this in turn will help strengthen the sports system in Canada; that if we have coaches needing athletes and athletes needing coaches, that if we can keep our athletes at home we can start keeping our coaches at home. If we have coaches, we will maintain the kind of program that will attract our athletes. So much for the government scholarships.

The Hockey Canada scholarships are a little different; they do require that the hockey player participate in a university program. They do require that the hockey player participate in the Canadian university program in order to strengthen university hockey. The theory behind the Hockey Canada program is to attempt to give an alternative system for hockey in this country; to develop university hockey at a level where it is the choice for the junior player; where he can get

good competitive hockey that will lead to an international stream and lead to excellence without necessarily going professional long before he has attained his academic potential. And that's the basic difference perhaps in the Hockey Canada scholarships and the Development scholarships. On all other bases we operate them in the same way.

We do expect not academic excellence but we do expect academic admission. It's the condition, of course, of the scholarship that the university admit, or the post-secondary school institution (it could be a community college, could be any number of them) that the student has the necessary academic requirement for admission. We require no more than that; we do require that he continue his sports program and he continue his academic program on the basis of admission.

Chairman Dick Moriarty: Dr. Donald MacIntosh on Practical Implications of Involvement in Athletic Scholarships.

Dr. Donald MacIntosh:

Fellow panelists and ladies and gentlemen.

I would like to discuss two aspects of athletic programs which have become synonomous with American university athletic scholarships--recruiting and commercialization. I'll discuss these from a pragmatic viewpoint within the Canadian university stream. There are three basic premises for my discussion. One is that these two practices (recruiting and commercialization of sport) are both detrimental to Canadian university sports; and two, that athletic scholarship programs may not necessarily result in recruiting and commercialization; but conversely that recruiting and commercialization can take place, can come into effect in Canadian sports without athletic scholarships. A third, that we need to take very positive action in regard to our position in Canadian sport on recruiting and commercialization of Canadian sport.

Some of the things that I am going to say about recruiting may be somewhat repetitive of what Dr. Van Vliet said, but I agree with him wholeheartedly that one of the greatest evils that faces us today is increased recruiting of athletes at the university level.

Most of us would agree that we have an obligation to provide students with information about the university and about athletic programs. On the other hand, all of us in this room, I think, would agree that recruiting by eight full-time scouts at Ohio State University is a gross distortion of any legitimate purpose of athletic program within our university. There are two aspects of recruiting that make it a most undesirable part of Canadian university athletic programs. First, extensive recruiting involves considerable cost in financial and human resources. If the university is to bear these costs it usually means that other aspects of the athletic program will suffer. This is probably a major reason why Canadian universities offer inter-collegiate athletic sports on a much broader scope than do most major universities in the United States. If this money is to come from outside sources, i.e. the money used for recruiting, it usually means that these sources will want to have a say in the manner in which athletics programs are conducted. And this in my opinion is one of the

major reasons for the development of commercialization of sports in the U.S.A. in their colleges and universities.

Another side effect in the development of extensive recruiting practices in Canada will be the separation of athletics and physical education. Persons who are attempting to combine both these careers will be unable or unwilling to devote a major portion of their time in the spring and summer to recruiting. The division of athletics and physical education may or may not be a desirable step but certainly one immediate implication is again the necessity of finding of funds to support extensive separate athletic staff at Canadian universities. Again I believe that the results of this step would be a reduction in the number of sports offered in Canadian universities and/or commercialization of our sports programs.

A second, but I think much more important objective to recruiting is the ethical aspect of this practice. On what grounds can we defend the well-known practice in the United States of 20 or 30 different college scouts harassing outstanding athletes, using every possible and necessary enticement to bring them to their campus. The fact that the athlete goes to university X instead of university Y does nothing to improve athletics in the United States. What is most likely to happen is that it destroys the ethical values of both the college scout and the athlete and results in the disintegration of the value system in college sports instead of the athlete.

The second possible corollary of athletic scholarship programs which I would like to discuss is commercialization. Most of us have been attempted at one time or another to hypothesize that if we could double the paid attendance to our football games, this revenue could well be used to support and enlarge the rest of the university's athletic program. Unfortunately experience in the United States does not support this hypothesis. Almost all universities which have attempted to commercialize their major sports programs and particularly in football have found that the cost related to the major sports has risen at least as rapidly as the revenue. Witness the statement by Ohio State University last winter.

A far more derogatory aspect of commercializing athletics and sports is the divorcing of the athletic programs from the universities. The majority of the American university major sports programs are considered by the academic community to be separate and apart from the mainstream of the educational programs at their institutions, since their major purposes have little or nothing to do with the primary purpose of the university, which is education. For this reason many people have predicted the death of major college sport in the United States. I think this prediction is probably optimistic, or pessimistic, whichever way you want to look at it. The role of college sport is so important to many influential, wealthy alumni and associates of the university that it would be impossible to abolish these programs, in fact in most American universities. This prediction, however, is not true for Canada and I believe that we stand an excellent chance of the abolishment of major intercollegiate athletics at Canadian universities if we move towards commercialization of our athletic programs.

The cultural pressures which force United States universities to acquiesce to commercialized sport do not exist in Canada. Our universities are housed by academics from the United Kingdom or from the United States who abhor commercialization of sports, particularly at the university level, and these people will be quick to move against commercialization of sports in the universities.

I would like to conclude with three positive statements. First of all, I think, as Dr. Van Vliet said, that third-party scholarships have the best chance, in my opinion, of enabling us to avoid the evils of recruiting and commercialization because the finances are again provided outside the university and there is no obligation between the university and the athlete.

Second, I would like to challenge Mr. Regimbal and say that we cannot piously sit and say that what happens in the United States is not going to happen in Canada. Once you ignore what is happening in the United States, it is my opinion that we stand a great chance of repeating their errors. I think the Intercollegiate Athletic Union, the C.I.A.U., in cooperation with the various university athletic conferences in Canada must direct their efforts to developing positional papers in regard to internal athletic scholarships, recruiting of athletes and commercialization of sports. I am optimistic to think that we can accomplish this if we set a high priority for it. And if we can accomplish it, I think the vast majority of athletic directors and coaches in Canada will voluntarily abide by guidelines. We must, however, face the necessity of disciplining universities and individuals who are not willing to accept the standards set by our colleagues. I do not agree with Mr. Regimbal that certain universities can develop and practice any standards that they wish, including athletic scholarships and commercialization. Our greatest weapon against universities who wish to involve themselves in commercialization and recruiting is to resolve not to participate against these universities. The major reason for financial enticement and recruiting by certain universities in Canada at this time is to gain national recognition and prestige. If those universities who do not wish to follow this practice will resolve to not compete against these universities, the major purposes for which they carry out these practices will be forfeit.

The third thing that I would like to say is that our guidelines in developing the policy and positional papers in regard to these evils must be established by asking two basic questions. One, is the practice or policy consistent with the educational outcomes of the athletic program? and two, is it in the interest of the student athlete?

Thank you very much.

Chairman Dick Moriarty: Dr. Pat Lawson will be our first reactor and hopefully will include some comments from the distaff point of view.

Dr. Pat Lawson:

Mr. Chairman, panelists, ladies and gentlemen. I am really not sure as to the function of a reactor, especially when you are very

strongly biased yourself? I suppose, theoretically, a reactor should reflect on both sides. Having been, having spent a long time, I couldn't avoid having my own biases and the speakers before me have already given a complete listing of the pros and cons, so what I said to myslef, and it was hard to do, was let's get right down to the nitty gritty. What would happen if we did have scholarships? either second party or third party government scholarships? How would the scene in Canada be changed a year from now or two years from now? In other words, we sort of skirt around, and I had trouble, when I tried to pinpoint exactly why there is some movement to incorporate athletic scholarships. And if I have missed one, I am sure that I will be reminded of it later. But the first one, maybe, that people have proposed for athletic scholarships to improve the calibre of Canada's National teams which is a very worthy objective. We all want to be proud of Canada and have medal athletes performing at a higher level in international competition. But the fact is that many of our international athletes do now in fact attend school in the United States. How many years is it going to be before we can hope to compete with the track scholarships of the University of Southern California? Partly for climate, largely because of population and numbers so that you do go and get the best training in the world and are still able to compete in our international scene. So I sort of waived that as one of the reasons for proposing scholarships. I think an analogy is, and again I think it is a function of our small population, I think we'll grow to other things. But I think the analogy is that people who have trained to world class in opera, for instance, go to Florence, Italy to get the best training, the best atmosphere of opera at that level. So this may change in the future, but at the present stance of our development, it's a fact of life, we don't have the climate, we don't have numbers of competitors at the international level.

Secondly, it is sometimes proposed as a reason for athletic scholarships to reward a special talent that these individuals have, and a special athletic ability, and scholarships should be made available to them on the basis of this special talent that they have. Then the comparison is obviously to the fact that some universities have music scholarships or drama scholarships. But I think that this is erroneous, because these people are pursuing degrees in music or drama. The only way that we could honestly do that would be to say, we'll give you a B.A. in football after your four years in university. We provide the training and the competition in football and then we give a Bachelor of Science degree or a Bachelor of Commerce degree. So that to say that because we have scholarships in music and drama does not apply to scholarships in football or track

Somebody mentioned here that the third possible reason for athletic scholarships is to become more competitive. Mr. Regimbal made the suggestion that some schools need this assistance while others don't. I feel with 1,500 population and some are 20,000 population that each school should be able to assess their needs and they can become competitive with the 25,000 population school if they be allowed to have athletic scholarships and I think a) that he has more faith in the probability of human beings than I have and b) I don't think this is at all workable. For instance, in the western conferences and these are hypothetical people, let's say, for instance, that Regina is not

comparative with Saskatoon, both universities in Saskatchewan, so should Regina be given the privilege of athletic scholarships. Saskatoon would turn around and say maybe, again hypothetically, that we are not comparative with the University of Edmonton or Manitoba or Vancouver, so Saskatoon should be given scholarships, and Edmonton and Vancouver could say we are not compatible with Toronto, so we should be given scholarships. So then, this is unworkable and who is to - as a result nobody can say that you may or may not. We say this could be an internal decision, well I think it is pretty obvious that we would all, to be competitive, we would all stay with the system now. But that doesn't solve any problems.

It is quite possible that the rationale for scholarships is to increase the level of excellence, not in this case, for international competition but maybe as an example to high schools, that the base may broaden, maybe more people will participate if they have this higher degree of excellence for which they aim. I think this means, then, that we would do that by giving a) scholarships to those who are already there, which I don't think would change anything very much or b) it means giving scholarships to athletes from other provinces or other countries and, in my opinion, this would have the opposite effect as far as increasing of Canadian calibre, no incentive to compete if we knew teams were to be made up of Americans. So I don't think we could accept that as rational reason for scholarships.

One that is spoken of most often is to stop the flow of athletes to the U.S.A. and I mentioned before that isn't all bad at our current stage of development. If you could get a track scholarship at Saskatoon or the University of Southern California
two million dollars. When I think that as long as (as Dr. MacIntosh said) we exist in the university setting this education has to come first. If a student chooses to be a professional football player, (and I agree with Mr. Lefaive that we shouldn't be picking on football), if his chosen profession is to be a professional football player, there should be some way (and this is what American schools are saying now) that he could get to be a professional football player without going through a college. What has happened is the pros have handed over the authority for the preparation of their product to the colleges. I don't think the colleges realized when they started it what they were doing, but that is in effect what they are doing. In fact, in baseball, you probably read this quite recently, in baseball, baseball players in the National League colleges they had their own farm systems. Now the farm systems have petered out. The college baseball isn't quite up to what they want to produce their baseball players so what they are doing, and you probably read this article, was just to go to the colleges and pick the best athlete whether he was a basketball player or a football player if he has the skills that they require in a baseball player, they are willing to take him from the campus give him a year of what is called professional preparation school and then they are pro baseball players. If professional sports want to train their products why does it have to be in the colleges? Just because it happened in the U.S. that way I don't think that that is the function of the universities. Their function is to give an education and if a student is willing to forego the education and pursue professional football, period, or hockey, then he should be able to do so.

The chairman is getting ready to clink the glass. First, I'd like to thank the chairman that he included a woman on his panel. I think we're finally coming to the stage when this is considered as a problem to do with our profession, our profession for both men and women. Farther than that, we now have national championships for women's intercollegiate athletics, the problems occuring to the men will occur or are occuring to the women. There are such things as women's athletic scholarships in the States. I was in Arizona for a year; Arizona State in Phoenix has a half-year assistance, most of the top golfers, most of the top tennis players, are on athletic scholarships. So it isn't something that is not of concern to us.

I was going to quote this article from the Columbus paper, almost everyone has, which is just making the point again, that all the schools in the U.S. are financially in trouble. There was one article I could find to bring ... to say just one school or one conference it was a survey of all conferences in the U.S. and they are all in financial trouble. Ohio State has been mentioned. For instance, their athletic budget for all sports is $3,319,328 for the current year, so we are just not going to compete for a long time. Even Tuscon, the University of Arizona, which is a relatively small school, but the football at Arizona which is a college of 3,000 students, football costs $850,000 and they are losing money. There is just no way that we can compete.

One more word and that is to Mr. Lefaive that having been involved in sports governing bodies and been involved in the Fitness Council and now C.I.A.U. who is making this application for a grant through Fitness and Amateur Sport I can appreciate the problems sitting at that level to say, "This is where the money should go, or that's where the money should go, or that's where the money should go." It is very difficult if not impossible. We tried things like the national hockey team. I thought that was a good idea and would like to know sometime what went wrong with that sort of concept besides the international problems but the concept of national teams is being revived. We now have national champs for anything that goes to national competition. So I say thanks to Mr. Lefaive for the effort but I just hope he can overcome all the problems involved.

Chairman Dick Moriarty: Dr. Earle F. Zeigler on Fitness and Amateur Sport Athletic Scholarships in Canada

Dr. Zeigler is our next reactor and I ask him to call on his Canadian and U.S. experience. Everyone has been doing that, perhaps you can call on your international experience.

Dr. Zeigler:

Mr. Chairman Dick, fellow panelists, Madam and Monsieur, and in Kitchener-Waterloo area, meine Dame und mein Herr.

My first reaction to the announcement of the Fitness and Amateur Sport athletic scholarships in Canada was one of mild horror. That was before I knew all the details. Then I realized that, you know, I was now a foreigner, and I probably ought to mind my own business. After

all, I reasoned, there is no doubt that Canadians won't repeat all the terrible mistakes that we have made in the States; they are too smart to do that. So figured that the formula or format that you will follow must necessarily have been so designed to carry out the plan in accordance with the highest of educational standards. Those are some of my initial assumptions.

And then, as I prepared this short reaction I had the benefit of the declarative statement prepared by Dean Van Vliet and not the others, as I went to Alberta last week for the World Symposium on the History of Sport and Physical Education. I find myself in complete agreement on most of the "specifics" as well. However, pluralistic philosophies of education and of athletics, of course, are permitted on this continent and each unique individual is entitled to his own beliefs. The recruitment of athletes has had a long and interesting history, dating back at least to the ancient Greeks. Recruiting student athletes to attend a particular university of college to obtain a bone fide education is not in itself a practice which can be condemned as bad or evil. The difficulty arises when the actual recruiting involves unnecessary, disapportionate or illegal factors designed to induce a young athlete, man or woman, to attend one particular college or university. Incidentally, historically recruiting is one thing--nothing wrong with that--subsidizing is another thing and some people have said, well, how do you do it? Proselytizing, where you steal him from on institution to entice him to another, that has usually been considered as a no-no. Well, basically therefore, I feel that university personnel might even have a duty to encourage qualified young people to attend an institution of higher education, so long as any offers of assistance are consonant with the educational aims of the college or university, and they are not restricted to some group whose purposes are subsidiary or actually contrary to those stated aims and objectives. Now, in my opinion, we get into difficulty because of hypocrisy. Competitive athletics has not been officially accepted as an integral phase of the democratic educational system. They don't give formula funds, for example, in Ontario for intercollegiate athletics. Maybe the day will come when they do. Intramurals, as I understand, is still up in the air and is in a shady area. But when that time comes, even though athletics has great spectator appeal to those in all walks of life, and even though anthropologists tell us that star athletes from all educational levels serve as our cultural maximizers, the social institution of competitive sport is fundamentally not considered to be respectable in our society. So if you were to look now at the Fitness and Amateur Sport Directorate and you might say, "Are they not attempting perhaps for the first time to make athletics and sport respectable in our society? Is that to be condemned? To this can be added immediately the most unfortunate distinction that has somehow developed between the amateur and professional in sport, a distinction that does not apply in the same way to similar aspects of the culture, such as music, dance, sculpture, painting or any other performing art. And so I would say immediately, do we give similar assistance, and I don't know this fact, to music, dance, sculpture, painting, no strings attached? Some group that knows its business designates you as an athlete says you have need of support. Now the need is another factor. In the States we say yes, we need you as a halfback.

And in answer to what Dr. Lawson said, I even sensed in what she said that she was not quite certain whether we really belong as an entity in an academic institution. I see nothing wrong eventually with the way the field is going, with a B.S. in Human Motor Performance in a specified activity--the theory and practice of that activity. What are you goig to do with it? I don't care. What are you doing to do when you get through with painting? What are you going to do when you get through with a degree in music? What are you going to do when you get through with a degree in art? It is something worthwhile in our society. Why can't a person master that from a theoretical and practical standpoint and have a good general education at the same time? I don't see anything wrong with that.

So it is difficult to draw any comparison, I think, between the Canadian and American scenes. A large number of American colleges and universities have been recruiting and subsidizing legally and illegally for many decades that athletes and their parents now accept the entire sordid affair as part of a way of life in the States. The obtaining of a number of offers has now become a status symbol which, if not received, is seemingly to the discredit of the athletes concerned. Further, there are so many souls of American educational administrators resting uneasily in limbo of misfeasance or malfeasance in office in the area of intercollegiate athletics that there probably won't be any room left for ordinary sinners like you and me. What advice can we possibly offer to Canada (based on past experience?) We can say with certainty that to recruit, subsidize and/or proselytize athletes in what has come to be regarded as either the legal or illegal American way, will only make a travesty of your style of educational ideals. Canada should avoid like the plague the concept of the tendered athlete, the one-two relationship as opposed to the third-party relationship. A certain amount of under-the-table help to needy athletes by alumni or misguided businessmen is impossible to control. Absolutely fundamental in this regard is that officials of the colleges and universities cannot be involved with such practices, either directly or indirectly. At present, Canadian intercollegiate athletics is so close to the ideal that the federal government, even a sincere attempt to improve Canada's international image in sports, should venture into this area only with the greatest amount of caution. If warning signals appear withdrawal from the scene should be so rapid that most people won't even know that the idea was contemplated and implemented to any degree. Talented, worthwhile young men and women really must have the opportunity for higher education in Canada regardless of their family's economic strata. If the country is to continue to move ahead at this time in the area of athletics and sports, primary concern should be to provide the finest type of coaches who will follow the highest standards in making competitive sport a force for good as it has the potential to be in our society. I don't think that any other goal is worthy of Canada at this time.

* * * * *

Chairman Dick Moriarty:

I indicated to the panel that we would give them several minutes at this time to comment on the reactions or the presentations of their fellow panelists; and I did indicate a couple of minutes for each one's

presentation and then I sense several in the audience would like to be involved and would like to present some questions to our panelists.

Mr. Maurice Regimbal:

I would like to react to a couple of things. I would like to react to the term education. We use it very often to mean the learning process that takes place in academic subjects and, of course, I refuse to accept that definition. I believe that education, of course, has to do with getting the individual to become most of what he is and I think there are in society a number of people who can be termed athletes. I think that an athlete is a dimension of a person's whole. I don't think that athletics, as far as an athlete participating in the sport, is periferal to his education. I think it is essential to his education and I suggest that we may look at the idea that when we start educating children, we find out first of all what they are because I think I can detect in young people those who are athletes and those who are not. I would like therefore that whether it be at the elementary, secondary or university level, when we are talking education that we mention such as the athletic ability of an athlete, the music ability of a musician, the dramatic ability of an actor, or what have you, and take it as integral part of the process of education of that person.

I would like also to react to the idea of commercialization. What bothers me all the time is the contradiction between the theory and the practice. We do commercialize university athletics. The C.I.A.U. has a contract with the CBC for $100,000 which we sold our rights for them to put them on television and International Nickel paid $35,000 for the hockey final to be televised in Sudbury. The O.-Q.A.A. gets $18,000 a year for their commercial rights. I just say let's not, you know, let's stop with becoming an academic thing, let's go into the facts and condemn them when we think they should be condemned.

Dr. Maury Van Vliet:

I think there is a fundamental difference, and I say frankly, Maurice, independent commercialism was talked about and apparently the universities have been getting financial support in one way or another, and I do not think, for instance, that a contract with the CBC for this pitiably inadequate finance the C.I.A.U. where we are attempting to keep from going bankrupt has anything to do with crass commercialism. I would like to say about Bobby Gage that my remarks about the sports writers did not include him. I would like to say also in all sincereity that as I listened to all of us I realized that Mr. Regimbal was a bit caught in the crossfire and I would like to say to you that his acceptance here on this panel and the kind of remarks that he makes come very much from the heart. I think that he is a very devout Canadian and I would say without any question that I could work with him in any athletic program and I admire his views and I think he has done a great job as a Canadian.

Mr. Lou Lefaive:

Dr. Zeigler probably said what I would like to say now that is, if I can say it. The government is involved in scholarships. It is an attempt and puts sport, physical activity, and physical recreation

in another dimension. It is trying to make it respectable. The schizophrenia that exists now at the university and as he well pointed out is true, is really there. It isn't part of the university program. The fact that Dr. Van Vliet has to say the C.I.A.U. is out begging for money is indicative of the fact that the university is not prepared to support itself. Do they want championships at the university level? If the universities are committed to it, why are they not finding the money to pursue excellence in other areas? I can see nothing wrong with that. If universities were using a professional athlete they could produce from their school of music a concert pianist who gets paid to play the piano. You rejoice in it. You hold him up as a great alumnus. What is so rotten about that same educational system producing a man who is going to earn his living in football? Your chemistry department doesn't get all up tight about producing a professional chemist, why is a physical educator so uptight about producing a professional athlete? It is not prostituting, not something to be ashamed of to produce excellence in sport. In my mind, it is as worthy a pursuit as any other cultural endeavour or for that matter, academic excellence.

Dr. Donald MacIntosh:

... we probably out of a preponderance of people who have spoken ... and I think we should give a chance for some other people.

Chairman Dick Moriarty:

Then I would entertain questions from the floor. If you have written out a question, Marge Holman or Terry Ball will pick them up and bring them forward. In the meantime anyone who has a question that they would like to put to the panel, I would like to suggest that you identify yourself, and your school.

Mr. Alan Coles, Dalhousie University:

I think we have had some truisms, that education is much broader than it ever was conceived to be and this is fine; we agree with this and we, I am sure, agree with the development of the best in sport as in any other cultural pursuit. The crux of the matter is, how do we decide how to distribute the funds? I have heard too often that if you have got a certain amount of money to be distributed for sports awards, of whatever you want to call them, or any other kind of award that you get pressure groups tending to distribute that money to, let's say football, hockey, basketball, track, perhaps, rather than to others. We have heard about lifetime sports, about the need for preparing people for the leisure age that's coming. Certainly this is true. Should this not be an added weight to the need to help people in other sports besides these that tend to receive. I think that we have seen glimmerings of this, but I think it is still pitifully small, and I wonder whether any of the panel, Mr. Lefaive, or anybody else, could suggest ways in which we are going to arrive at priorities within our culture to give such awards.

Mr. Maurice Regimbal:

I would like to take a crack at it. I think it is very interesting. Of course, I don't believe that only football players, hockey players or basketball players should be included. I think any golfer who has

the ability deserves the same kind of attention. I would like to pursue at least the idea that maybe sports associations would be interested in getting into the scheme of helping us develop our athlete. It grieves me when a young athlete from Sudbury for example, is a young golfer, ends up playing golf for the University of Michigan. Why should he go to Michigan? Why can't I devise some kind of thing here if he wants to play golf here. The financing is very difficult. It may be true working through the sports associations, for those who participate within the framework of the university context could be the source of help.

Dr. Earle Zeigler:

I suggest that a lot of this goes back to the money distinction. When we think of somebody who is a professional musician we don't expect that he is going to open a tavern when he gets tired of playing his instrument or we don't expect that a painter is going to sell insurance, which is a bone fide activity in its own right. Subsequently, and I think, therefore, we ought to, if we ...

Mr. Lou Lefaive:

So the coaches have not been considered in all these ... statement just like that.

New Speaker:

The coach in hockey is in our Canadian scheme.

Chairman Dick Moriarty:

I think that was an adequate answer to complete the specific question.

Question directed to Dr. Van Vliet:

Should those in favour of scholarships form one association and those opposing scholarships form another association?

Dr. Maury Van Vliet:

Well, I am relatively involved, interest all my life in the total Canadian situation relative to competition and this is one of the things I fear, quite frankly; I think that we have the problems that we always have in terms of disparaties in population and enrollment in the various universities and I think that up to date within reason we have done a fairly good job of bringing the Canadian university athletic family together in one unit and moving on. The progress may have been very slow. I won't argue that. But I think it has been good, I think it has been healthy and I think it has been on a pretty good ethical plane. The minute you reverse this situation I'm sure what will happen is that you will get into the kind of problem where you probably will have three conferences and those who absolutely think they are pure; those honouring scholarships, so-called scholarships with no holds barred. You will have another group that will probably pick up the telephone and say let's form the Big Ten on the Canadian scene and to hell with the small universities. Now, up to date, we have been able to avoid that and I

hope with all my heart to see us continue to go forward as one group.

Chairman Dick Moriarty:

I have a question here for Dr. Pat Lawson.

An Ottawa-St. Lawrence study shows that 10% of the Canadian students that went to the U.S. on athletic scholarships returned with degrees and playing experience only. Do you think athletic scholarships and serious studies are compatible?

Dr. Pat Lawson:

I don't think they are compatible to the extent that an athlete is required to finish all his classes by 1:30 and be on the practice field by 2:00 every day, that they must devote the evenings, the afternoons, taking the normal effort required by the student average or above average in our schools. There just isn't that much extra time that he could be getting the same degree of football or track and field or whatever. They add up to more than 100%.

Chairman Dick Moriarty:

Maurice Regimbal, would you like to--you indicated that you would like to say something.

Mr. Maurice Regimbal:

I would just like to react to Maury's statement and I think it just seems to support my view. This is why I wanted to point out, we have advanced bringing all universities together in a kind of competitive situation and I think in Canada it is very important to the unity of our country and we have done so with every university developing policies of its own. There are as many policies practiced as there are universities. It is only on paper that we would like to establish a similar set of rules. I would suggest, therefore, that to relieve the situation as it is, to let the universities have their own policies which could become the formal policy of the university.

Chairman Dick Moriarty:

We haven't been lacking in direction on this panel; Scott Young had an article in the Toronto Telegram indicating what my first question to the panel should be. He writes of Dolegwicz, the shot putter and discus thrower in Toronto, and indicates that he has been approached by a number of U.S. institutions and suggests, "How can we justify opposing athletic scholarships in Canadian universities when as a direct result we drive a boy like Bishop Dolegiwicz to the United States?" Dr. MacIntosh, would you like to respond to that?

Dr. Donald MacIntosh:

I think it is unrealistic of us to think that we are going to prevent world class athletes from going to USC or Michigan in the next five or ten years. This may be a reasonable objective. I certainly regret that outstanding athletes from Canada are going to the U.S.A. and I don't regret too much, however, if he wants to get action where it is

happening in the United States and I think that, unfortunately, the news media and many people in Canada have glamorized the U.S. athletic scholarship program. It is, in essence to me, in many cases, is attractive between a commercial sport enterprize and an athlete and seems to me to not have anything to do with what I would think athletics should mean in the universities.

Mr. Lou Lafaive:

I think that we all agree that we want to avoid abuses in scholarships. I feel that there is no way to stop the Canadian athletes from going to the United States at the present time. But surely, we have to worry about that Canadian athlete as much as we worry about the athletes who stay home, and surely we have to start somewhere developing a system in Canada that will keep the athlete at home and not let him become a puppet of the recruiting system in the U.S. So where do you start? We are getting into a viscious circle here. If we sit back and do nothing then they keep going to the States into a bad system. If we keep saying that we can't compete with that system where do we ever stop or ever start? It seems to me we have to start doing something in Canada that will not be perfect and will not solve the problem tomorrow but is a basis for a system that will develop and maybe will counteract what is going on in the United States and Canada in ten or fifteen years from now.

Chairman Dick Moriarty:

Further on in the column there is a statement that was just made for Dr. Zeigler. I will just read it so that you can respond to it. Speaking of his high school coach he says,

> "In a way, I have mixed emotions on this. In a way I am delighted to see a boy getting this kind of a chance. When I was a student here in the 1950's myself we had a lot of good guys in track and field who just finished school and got jobs and that was that. No chance to go on to college. Now it is differnt. A scout from the University of Michigan saw a lot of Bishop at meets both here and in the U.S. and wanted him. So did a lot of others. Last year Bishop came to realize that his main chance for a scholarship, which he wanted badly, was to concentrate on field events, so he dropped football after four years and devoted his full athletic time to his field events. In a U.S. school right now Bishop would be a god, practically doing what he had done here. In Canada he is just another guy around.

Dr. Karle Zeigler:

I don't know that you can pen that down, but I would like to follow up on what Lou Lafaive has said. It seems to me that the only way that--one of the ways that we are going to prevent too many people from perhaps going to specific institutions over the line, and this sort of thing, is to develop some sort of coaches and programs here that will

keep them. And I think this perhaps can be done when we change our whole emphasis in the physical education programs and somehow or other Canada is so structured that it is doing this at the present time to more of a disciplinary approach on the theory and practice of human movement as applied to activity and sport and perhaps to exercise and this sort of thing. And so that part doesn't bother me. I would like to look forward to the time when some fellows from the United States want to come to Canada to take part and participate under a particular coach in a particular institution, if that coach was such a person who sets such high standards of excellence and was a fine educator and they felt that they wanted to come and take part with this coach. Now, is that happening in some places, maybe it is. But I don't see why it should be reversed the other way. I don't see why it couldn't be reversed in the other direction. It seems to me that in the final analysis this getting back to going to Rome to study art or something like that.

Chairman Dick Moriarty:

Dr. Zeigler, while you are on your feet, I have two more questions and this will be on it. One from Joseph Kurtzman, I presume, since you would rather see improved coaching in Canada, are you willing to give athletic scholarships for prospective coaches?

Dr. Earle Zeigler:

Well, the Fitness and Amateur Sport Directorate has been sending people over to the United States and to other institutions and in some cases other countries, I presume in order to go on and pursue doctoral programs in the field. I don't see why a coach like Councilman who is highly qualified as a theorist and then goes out and puts it into practice isn't the ideal that I feel we should work for. So if that's what we want to do, give a scholarship to a man to become a fine coach, and a fine educator, I think it's fine.

Dr. Maury Van Vliet:

I think we have to make this statement that the coaching across the line isn't that much better, in fact, many of those fellows can't coach worth a nickel--they are very good recruiters and they have a pretty good staff built up around them and they are lousy coaches and I know that Canadian coaches are excellent right across the country. We have some wonderful coaches in Canada, but we just aren't going out and buying athletes. Councilman doesn't make swimmers--he buys them from Edmonton.

Dr. Bill Orban:

I have found it very difficult to sit here quietly for quite a while now. When I first got out in the field I was idealistic as well and I remember being on the executive committee of the old C.I.A.U. and I remember Carson from Queen's being there and a couple of the old timers. I raised this issue at least three or four times. I know Queen's had one of the best networks, recruiting networks in Ontario. There were scholarships being given because, unfortunately, I reclined a letter offering somebody some money. I knew this was going on. I knew McGill

was doing this, and I tried repeatedly to bring this to the attention--have some committee set up to investigate it. No go. Well, after the hard facts of life and after eight years of the rough and tumble of practice, I have reversed my decision, and I am now in favour of athletic scholarships. The question I ask is this--and I ask this of anybody on the panel--are we not hanging onto something like we are hanging onto many of the moral things such as pot, such as abortion, such as free-lance relationships, and all of these things which are going on now? Now the legislators are saying well you have to live with the times, you have to change your code to agree with what people are practicing. Everywhere I look I find the practice does not--and I think I agree with Mr. Regimbal--the practice does not agree with the theory. We are saying one thing, and keep repeating it, but in fact it is not happening, and many of the places where we react do not happen. And so I ask this question--you know, are we hanging onto something that is not realistic and is not with the times, or is there really some change that we should try to affect at this time? I must admit that if at Ottawa we had the money we would give scholarships at this time, the biggest problem is that we haven't got the money.

Chairman Dick Moriarty:

We could go on and on with this. I think, as chairman, I am going to take the prerogative to throw out a potential answer to that question.

Now, I was born and raised in the United States and I have spent the last twenty years in Canada. I have been educated in schools on both sides of the border and I have been in athletics on both sides of the border, in fact, one of my prospective alma maters has been maligned to no end this afternoon--Ohio State University. And I was going to point out that money there is awarded on need, Woody Hayes' need.

I went down to Ohio State thinking I had the answer to all of their problems in the United States, and to this athletic scholarship question. I thought they were bad guys in a bad system. I went to work in their athletic department for several months and I found out they are not bad guys--they are good guys in a bad system. They're just the same as we are and they never planned it this way. They never planned to get into the system they have. It was just a series of little steps--it was just not standing up and being counted when someone called them from a high school, "Will you pick up the phone and call the registrar, because I have got a good kid and his marks are a little bad and he spent a little too much time in athletics but he is a good kid, he can do it if you can get him in." And then once they had him in what were they going to do with him--make sure he gets into some courses that he can handle and if the money is good when it comes from the university why isn't it good when it comes from the alumni. If it is going to come from the government, why isn't it good when it comes from industry? So I came back knowing I didn't have the answers.

If anything they said--why on earth would you want to change--whenever we read the papers we always read about the Canadians looking for something uniquely Canadian you have something uniquely Canadian,

when you can develop a student athlete that I feel compares with any in the world as a student and an athlete. Now, for a boy to go from Windsor to Bowling Green to spend four hours a day on football, ... are better athletes no doubt. But diminishing return sets in there rather rapidly in their academic excellence also diminishes very, very rapidly. So I think we want to be careful in this spiral in attempting to secure athletic excellence that we don't give away something that we have that is very good and is very uniquely Canadian.

I am beginning to feel myself that it is somewhat of a dichotomy--once you make that step across the line, it is going to be very, very difficult to hold.

That's in response to Dr. Orban, and I have been looking at the O.-Q.A.A. history and I agree that practice has not matched up to principle, but I think we better spell out principle and the way people can act a little more thoroughly and perhaps this might be a step in the right direction.

Question:

What specific steps do we take now? What will happen as a result of this meeting?--from Ken Bellmore, Dalhousie University.

Mr. Maurice Regimbal:

Before we make any decisions I would like to tell you an incident that happened when we talked about it--there was no pressure, there was no--nobody was wanting athletic scholarships. I had the opportunity to be involved in the negotiations of the Hockey Canada scholarships with the AUCC and we prepared our homework very well. ... because you were expected to be kind of ... negative attitude towards the introduction of scholarships for hockey ability combined with academic ability in the universities. Of course we did go through the AUCC which is the body of Presidents of Canada. But with it Mrs. Patterson was in charge of awards and she said, you know, we wondered how long it would be before people in sports would come and ask us to introduce as one of our programs a scholarship which is due to athletic ability. All we had to do was explain the program, it was brought to the Committee of Presidents and it was moved by Dr. Deutsch and seconded by Dr. Williams, I think, of Western, and accepted unanimously that athletic scholarships be introduced and that the names would be used--because we would have to use bursaries because of the athletic scholarships and they said no. They are athletic scholarships, that's what they will be and it was unanimously approved by the Presidents of the Universities. What are we going to do? I think what we have to do is organize ourselves properly and I think the system is excellent.

Dr. Donald MacIntosh:

I would like to reemphasize that I think these are very good for the times. And I think we need to get, just as you said Dick, we need to get a statement of our policies and purposes and I think it is essential at this time that we do in terms of recruiting. I don't care about developments in Sudbury that you would like to have more. What I don't like is seventeen of us chasing off to Winnipeg to get one golfer to go to one of seventeen universities.

Now what we must do now, I think, in the C.I.A.U. and in the various associations is to set down what our policies are in regard to athletic scholarships, which we have been procrastinating and avoiding, in terms of recruiting athletes and in terms of commercialization of sports and then Bill, I think it is time for us to stand up and be counted and, as I say, I think these are the things we have to do.

Dr. Maury Van Vliet:

I might just say that at the C.I.A.U. meeting this last week, the machinery was put into effect to do exactly that. It is a difficult thing to do, that is, looking forward to having an enforcement officer, for instance, that's what the NCAA has and that's what they call him and he has an office and a staff and he is called an enforcement officer.

Dr. Earle Zeigler:

Some day we will have a J. Edgar Hoover.

Dr. Maury Van Vliet:

Probably he is a very nice guy, he just happens to be the enforcement officer. This has been something that has been very evidently neglected. There has been a motion passed by a committee set up in the C.I.A.U., nothing to do with me, but the Union is going to put down in writing exactly what financial aid is as they see it and what is not and then as a result of that, once it is approved, there may be universities put on probation and not allowed to compete in national championships. We hope that this whole thing will be corrected to the point where this is not necessary. But the machinery has been put into effect to set this up so at least people at every university in Canada know what the C.I.A.U. regulations are concerning financial aid.

Chairman Dick Moriarty:

I don't know whether the inflamatory question has burned itself out or if we are looking at our watches and seeing that the beer garden will be open pretty soon, but at any rate I am going to declare the meeting adjourned. Before I do I have some abstracts, rather sketchy, but I think they do contain the drift of the initial presentations. If anyone would like them, they may pick them up afterwards. We did tape the proceedings and we will attempt to publish them later. If you would like a copy write to me at the University of Windsor and finally, I would like to thank our panelists because they have taken time out from a very busy schedule. They are real professionals and we thoroughly enjoyed them.

* * * * *